DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 234 UD 015 628

AUTHOR Thompson, Bryan; Agocs, Carol
TITLE Studying the Local Community: A Community Survey and Ethnic Mapping Procedure.
INSTITUTION Michigan Ethnic Heritage Studies Center, Detroit.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *City Demography; Community Characteristics; *Community Surveys; *Ethnic Distribution; Geographic Distribution; Maps; Measurement Techniques; Racial Distribution; Research Methodology; Research Proposals; Residential Patterns; Social Distribution; Statistical Data; *Urban Population
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan (Detroit)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to outline a rationale and procedure for surveying and mapping the ethnic composition and community characteristics for local units both in the City of Detroit and neighboring suburbs. Both educational and practical benefits are claimed for this project. Data will be collected for a small section of the city. Generally such data are not available in published reports since data collection units usually are not at such a fine scale. The nature of the data it is proposed here to collect differs from that available in the census and most other published reports. The ethnic map of local areas will be of value, it is argued, since it will not only portray the ethnic make-up of the area but also will show the degree to which spatial clustering has been maintained. The monograph is divided into five sections. The first is an outline of the rationale for conducting a community survey. The second, a theory section, focuses on ethnicity, neighborhood, and community. The third section outlines methodological considerations for mapping and surveying a community. Suggestions for ethnic research projects in the Detroit area are then discussed. Finally, a sources section follows, with references and information related to Detroit ethnic bibliography sampling, questionnaire design and interviewing technique, and data and agency sources. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

UDO 1662

STUDYING THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

A Community Survey and Ethnic Mapping Procedure

Developed By:

Bryan Thompson
Department of Geography
Wayne State University

and

Carol Agocs
Ethnic Studies Division
Center for Urban Studies
Wayne State University

Published by:

Michigan Ethnic Heritage
Studies Center
71 East Ferry
Detroit, Michigan 48202

313/872-2225

UD 015 628

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A COMMUNITY SURVEY AND ETHNIC MAPPING PROCEDURE [1]

Introduction

Dr. John A. Carpenter summarizes needs and problems expressed in proposals submitted for grants under Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Ethnic Studies Program.[2] A sample of these needs and problems suggest:

1) ".....restriction of the cultural experience in the school to a single, dominant culture is a cause of educational alienation for some students and a source of severe ethnocentrism for all."

2) "There is need for an inter-cultural dimension in education. The task is to incorporate data and experiences from domestic ethnic cultures into the regular program which is pursued by the majority of students."

3) The capacity and willingness of teachers for "openness, trust, and ability to communicate with persons, young and adult, from other cultures."

4) A problem typifying many of the proposals was "the emphasis on studying about cultures, rather than directly experiencing them".

In the conclusion to his foreward, Dr. Carpenter states:

"We need to develop sound models, analytic and experience-based, which focus both upon understanding the processes of culture and participating in them. The most significant source of experience is in our own communities, especially our pluralistic communities. While some ethnic communities express antagonism toward schools which they see as mono-cultural, these communities could instead become cooperative locations of second culture experiences, partners with our schools in designing an appropriate education for students. The variety of human expression so real in the lives of people can then become a force for education in classroom and home, with child learning interculturally from child, and citizen from citizen."

Our purpose in this paper is to outline a rationale and procedure for surveying and mapping the ethnic composition and community characteristics for local units both in the City of Detroit and neighboring suburbs. Hopefully, this exercise will address some of the problems and needs reflected in Dr. Carpenter's comments. Ideally the project could be implemented as a coordinated social studies project centered around the area's school systems, ranging from

the elementary level through to the university. Clearly other interested centers would not be precluded from involvement in the project. However, complete participation by all school systems is not essential since any one community study could stand alone and still be useful for that community's purposes. The project, ambitious though it may be, is certainly less ambitious than that of the geographer Sir L. Dudley Stamp, who marshalled the schoolboys of England during World War II to produce a nationwide land use study that is still used today.

This monograph is divided into five sections:

1) An outline of the rationale for conducting a community survey.
2) A theory section with discussion centered on: (a) ethnicity, (b) neighborhood, (c) community.
3) An outline of methodological considerations for mapping and surveying a community.
4) Suggestions for ethnic research projects in the Detroit area.
5) A sources section with references and information related to: (a) Detroit ethnic bibliography, (b) Sampling, (c) Questionnaire design and interviewing technique, (d) Data and agency sources.

Rationale

The community survey and mapping project is valuable from an educational standpoint. Some of the educational benefits are summarized as follows:

1) The exercise is experiential and communicative as students become involved with their community, relatives, and other community residents. Involvement generally leads to greater self-awareness as students are confronted with questions of their own identity, their family history, and the historical processes that have been at work in their community. Furthermore, since most communities exhibit some measure of heterogeneity the project will

foster inter-cultural contacts and understanding.

2) In conducting the survey, students acquire skills common to many of the social sciences. Observational skills will be developed during the course of the survey, which will employ sampling techniques and interviewing procedures. Later in the survey there is exposure to methodologies involving data collection, coding, mapping, graphing, statistical analysis, writing, and editing.

3) Participants in the survey will, through inductive processes growing out of their own experience, gain theoretical insights into topics such as:

(a) Migration (to the country, within the country, to the city, within the city)

(b) Assimilation and acculturation (melting pot vs. triple melting pot vs. cultural pluralism, etc.)

(c) Community and neighborhood

(d) Social networks in an urban setting

A community survey and mapping project will, in addition to the pedagogical benefits, be of practical value for the following reasons:

1) Data will be collected for a small section of the city. Generally such data are not available in published reports since data collection units usually are not at such a fine scale. For example, the smallest unit used by the United States Bureau of the Census is the block; unfortunately, information at this scale is very limited. The next larger unit used is the census tract, a unit usually consisting of from 4 - 5,000 people. Unfortunately, census tracts tell nothing of demographic variations within them, and their boundaries rarely coincide with the physical and psychological boundaries perceived by residents.

2) The nature of the data we are proposing to collect differs from that available in the census and most other published reports. In addition to the ethnic mapping aspects of the project, information can be collected on items relating to the social history of the community, the adequacy of available services (public transportation, police, schools, shopping, medical care, etc.), the importance of kinship networks in the area, the quality of the physical environment (housing, pollution effects, etc.), and the nature of the boundaries both within the community and with adjacent communities.

3) The ethnic map of local areas will be valuable since it will not only portray the ethnic make-up of the area but also will show the degree to which spatial clustering has been maintained. In a number of communities throughout the Detroit area spatial clustering is a recent, on-going process, as for example in south Dearborn where approximately 400 - 600 persons from the village of Tibnine, Lebanon reside within about five blocks of each other.[3]

A generalized ethnic map of the Detroit area published in 1972 (see pages 12-15) has been useful for a wide variety of local agencies. The technique has been adopted or modified in other cities, and requests for maps have been nationwide and even worldwide in scope. Detailed maps at a finer scale will be equally useful for agencies operating at the neighborhood level.

The next section, which precedes our discussion of the procedures for conducting a community survey and mapping activity, discusses some of the issues related to defining ethnicity, neighborhood and community.

Theoretical Considerations: Ethnicity, Neighborhood, and Community

1. Models of Social Reality: The Melting Pot or Pluralism?

The picture of American society that appears to be most widespread is an image of a polarized society, consisting of "whites" and "non-whites", or

"minorities".[4] Within each of these categories, according to this image in its popularized form, everyone is pretty much alike: white people share essentially similar ideals, interests and views of the world; "non-whites" are fundamentally alike. Each of these two categories, then, is viewed as a melting pot - one for whites, and another for "minorities".

How is the American melting pot supposed to have worked for whites, and how is it envisioned to work for minorities in the future? In brief, all the multitudes of individuals who have come to the cities of America from other countries, or from rural parts of the United States, are expected to rid themselves of their unique cultures, views of the world, and ways of doing things, and think and act like generalized Americans. Institutions such as the schools, social agencies, and factories and other places of employment are intended to help melt them down into a common mould. In return for shedding their communities, and their identities as members of communities, they are rewarded with the chance to achieve as individuals in American society, to share in the opportunities of American life. That is, they can use the institutions provided for them, work very hard, and thus gain the opportunity to have a better job, more income, and more acceptance from the larger society than their parents had.

"Minorities", particularly Blacks, were the first in recent years to call public attention to the fact that the generalized American melting pot is not working, and that the minority melting pot does not exist. Other groups watched as Blacks, Latinos and Native Americans challenged the notion of the melting pot both as a social reality, and as a social goal, and asserted their desires to preserve and build upon the strengths of their own unique cultures.

Then other groups began to question the existence of the "successful" melting pot -- the one into which all the whites were supposed to have merged. Many people began to wonder whether they really had given up their communities and identities in order to share the rewards of achievement in America. They began to question how much they had really achieved and were able to achieve, and how much they had lost. They, like many members of "minority groups", began to question whether it is really necessary for all to become alike in order for all to participate equally in the promise of American life.

Increasing numbers of social scientists now are supporting a pluralistic model of American society.[5] They have begun to document the degree to which American social reality has been, and continues to be, multi-ethnic. In doing so, they have discovered that there is a great deal of variation among whites, as well as among peoples lumped together into that other pot.[6]

2. The Detroit Setting

Detroit can be considered a living example of the reality of pluralism. A rich variety of ethnic communities and neighborhoods are found today not only within the city, but in the suburbs of the metropolitan area. About 27 percent of the white population of the Detroit metropolitan area was of foreign birth or parentage in 1970. Another 18 percent of the population of the metropolitan area -- or 44 percent of the City of Detroit alone -- are Blacks, according to the 1970 census. It is impossible to accurately estimate the number of Detroiters who are grandchildren of immigrants, or the number for whom ethnic identity, or participation in ethnic community life, remains meaningful.

To study the development of the Detroit area is to study the history of its peoples -- the many ethnic groups who contributed in a great variety of ways to the city's growth. Detroit's peoples today still include the descendants of

the city's first residents and builders -- Native Americans, French, English, Scots, and Yankees from the northeastern states. They include those who have built the city's industries, schools, churches, businesses, labor unions, and cultural insitituions as we know them today -- the Germans, Irish, Poles, Blacks, Hungarians, Italians, Jews, Latinos, and countless other groups, both large and small.

Over the generations these peoples and many others have built flourishing communities and neighborhoods in Detroit and its suburbs. Many of these communities are viable today, although often not in the location where they were first established. With the passage of years there have been many changes in the social geography of the Detroit area. It would be interesting and worthwhile to map not only the ethnic composition of Detroit's neighborhoods today, but also to map changes in the ethnic makeup of particular neighborhoods over time. Most of the city's neighborhoods have undergone ethnic succession. One east side area, for example, was first inhabited predominantly by French, then British, then Germans, then Italians, and now Blacks.

3. Defining Ethnicity

The reality of ethnic pluralism and ethnic community life is best appreciated by looking closely at the history and development of a city like Detroit, or at the variegated mosaic of communities and neighborhoods the city still presents to the aware observer. Yet there is a need for more generalized definitions of ethnicity to guide our observation of the social reality we seek to understand.

There are almost as many definitions and uses of the concept of "ethnicity" as there are scholars who have studied ethnic groups. One of the simplest and most widely used is the notion of the ethnic group as a population that is set off by race, religion, or national origin, or a combination of these. In this sense, an ethnic group is a social category. There is no necessary implication

in this definition of consciousness, or self-identification, or social ties of any kind among individuals who are members of the same category: these elements may or may not be present. Neither does this way of defining ethnicity contain an implicit explanation of how a culture and a sense of peoplehood are passed on to the next generation, nor indeed a requirement that these be present at all.

For example, when the U. S. Census tells us that there were 159,643 people of Polish foreign stock in the Detroit metropolitan area in 1970, it is simply reporting on the number of people of Polish birth or parentage. This is an important but limited way to define and count the Polish ethnic group or population. It does not convey to us how many people identify themselves as Poles, or how many take part in activities in the Polish community, or draw upon elements of the Polish heritage in raising their children.

Looking at ethnicity as a social category leaves something to be desired for purposes of community studies. But it is the kind of definition that lies behind much of the available information about Detroit's ethnic peoples and neighborhoods, including the U. S. Census, and other data collected by government agencies, and survey data derived from individual or household responses to questionnaires.[7] It is also the most feasible kind of definition of ethnicity to use in an initial mapping and description of a neighborhood or community.

Most discussions conceptualizing society in terms of relations between "minority groups" and "the majority" also view ethnic groups as social categories. "Minorities" are usually considered to be ethnically-labeled groups that hold subordinate positions in a context of power relations within a society. Discussion of ethnic groups as subordinate minorities usually include only Blacks, Latinos, Native Americans, and groups of Asian origin. When white ethnic groups are defined as social categories, people beyond the immigrant and second generations are usually excluded from consideration, as for example, in the case

of the U. S. Census. The census definitions and other classifications of ethnic groups as social categories, frequently entail vague or unsatisfactory ways of specifying nationality of origin, and of sorting out national origin from language, religious or cultural group.

Another definition of ethnicity that may provide a meaningful orientation point for community studies has been proposed by Otto Feinstein:

> Ethnicity means peoplehood, a sense of commonality or community derived from networks of family relations which have over a number of generations been the carriers of common experiences. Ethnicity, in short, means the culture of people and is thus critical for values, attitudes, perceptions, needs, mode of expression, behavior, and identiy, whether or not we are conscious of our ethnic identity.[8]

This definition views the ethnic group as a social network. It emphasizes ties among people, and shared experience over time, as the critical aspects of ethnicity.[9] These are also key elements in a meaningful definition of "community", as will be seen shortly.

4. Defining Community and Neighborhood

Just as every social scientist seems to have his or her own definition of ethnicity, so there are as many notions about community as there are publications on the subject. Definitions of what a community is are often mixed with ideas about what a community ought to be, and there is a vast literature analyzing and comparing the various definitions and concepts of community.[10]

There does seem to be a tendency for social scientists to define a community as a relatively permanent local social grouping that is either (1) interactional in character, or (2) territorial in nature, or both.

Those who see the community as an interactional entity tend to view it as a pattern or network of social relations. What is emphasized is the number, kinds, intensity and functions of social relationships existing among members

of the community: members are of course, those who participate in the social network.[11]

Those who conceive of the community as essentially a territorial entity tend to define it as a settlement that is confined within a defined geographic space. What is important here is the relationship of residents with the turf they occupy, and with other territories outside these particular local boundaries.[12]

In an effort to clarify concepts, we will henceforth refer to the territorial community as a neighborhood, and the interactional community as a community. The concept "neighborhood" here suggests a relationship between people and the territory where they dwell. "Community" suggests a social network, a set of relationships among people who may or may not reside in a common territory. Thus a community may also be a neighborhood, but is not necessarily one. And a neighborhood may or may not be a community, depending upon whether or not its occupants are involved in significant social interaction with each other.

There are, of course, ethnic neighborhoods and ethnic communities. There are multi-ethnic and non-ethnic neighborhoods and communities. Our image of the traditional ethnic neighborhood is one of a well defined territory which, when outsiders enter it, tantalizes the senses with smells of exotic foods drifting out of windows, and sounds of people speaking in unfamiliar languages. Many such immigrant ethnic neighborhoods still exist in Detroit.

Nowadays, the observer does not always recognize an ethnic neighborhood when he is in one. People in Warren or Dearborn don't dance the polka in the streets, but they may be involved in intensive interaction with other Poles living nearby, and thus be residents of ethnic neighborhoods.[13] Or they may be involved in active interaction with other Poles who live scattered across

the city and suburbs, but who do not share an ethnic neighborhood. Such communities are of quite recent origin and have rarely been studied.

Thus, there are many kinds of ethnic communities -- some may be neighborhood-based, and some may not be. Most ethnic communities were probably tied to particular territories at some time in their development, both by choice, and by economic necessity and other constraints. Some communities may remain confined within specific localities primarily because they lack alternatives: the movements of their members are restricted or constrained. Such ethnic communities have been called ghettos.[14]

5. Studying the Community or Neighborhood

The mapping of a particular locality within a metropolitan area would generally involve an initial focus upon neighborhood. The neighborhood, once it has been chosen and its boundaries agreed upon, becomes an object of study. As they proceed to map the neighborhood and to observe, describe and catalog its traits and qualities, the research group may find that their neighborhood is a community.

The broadening of a mapping project or survey into a community study requires the use of new research tools. The community study is an important research approach within social science. It often entails an attitude that goes beyond a view of the community as an object of study, and demands the direct participation or involvement of the researchers in the life of the community. This poses few problems of access to researchers who live in and have long participated in the community. Such researchers have a distinct advantage over the social scientist from the outside who wishes to do field work in a community; he or she usually finds it necessary to move into and become part of the community to the greatest degree possible. This is the beginning of the community study as a research approach.

The mapping of a local community or neighborhood can be the first step in

a study of that neighborhood. The methodological suggestions that follow are based upon our experience in constructing an ethnic map of the Detroit metropolitan area in 1971, using a survey as the data source (see Figure 1).

FIGURE I

[insert 1971 map]

The map was developed by superimposing a one mile grid or checkerboard upon a base map of the Detroit area; students then conducted four brief interviews with residents of each of the neighborhoods corresponding to the cells of the grid. The information from the survey was then coded and plotted on the base map; resulting ethnic clusters were outlined. Similar procedures can be used to map the ethnic compositions of neighborhoods and local communities within the metropolitan area.

Methodological Considerations

The neighborhood or local area survey, part of which could be used to construct an ethnic map, can be based on a sample survey. The object of any sampling procedure is to reproduce the characteristics of the entire population of the unit of study within a selected subgroup of that population.[15] The nature and size of the sample will depend on a number of factors including:

1) the geographic area to be covered by the survey,
2) the manpower and time available to conduct the survey,
3) the amount of information desired.

1. Sampling

The block divisions used by the census would be ideal as the basic unit for the survey since published information is available for blocks.[16] Furthermore, information based on block data could be aggregated to census tracts.

If the manpower is insufficient for a complete survey of all blocks, then sampling procedures could be used, for example:

1) taking a systematic sample of blocks within each tract (every other block, every third block, etc.)

2) taking a random sample of blocks within each tract. Each block would have to be numbered and the sample drawn using random number tables. Again the size of the sample would depend on time, manpower, and need.

3) A square grid (square cells) could be placed over the study area and random samples taken in residential areas. If the study area is large, then it might be desirable to vary the size of the grid since population densities decrease with increasing distance from the center of the city.

2. Questionnaire [17]

The nature of the questionnaire will vary depending on the purpose of the survey. In making the 1971 ethnic map of the Detroit metropolitan area the questionnaire was brief and simple.[18] The interviewer first introduced himself and the purpose of the study, explaining that he was working on a class project to make a map of locations of ethnic groups in Detroit. He or she gave examples of ethnic groups, perhaps mentioning Blacks, Southern Whites, Poles, Germans, Jews and others. Then the following questions were asked: 1) "Do you know whether most of the people living in this neighborhood -- at least half of the residents -- are members of one ethnic group?"; 2) if not, "Are there two or three groups taken together that make up at least half of the population of the neighborhood? If so, which groups?"; 3) If not, "Are there more than three ethnic groups in this neighborhood? If so, please list as many as you can."

Informants were asked to name specific streets and blocks where the ethnic groups they mentioned were living. Responses were recorded on a structured form.

Non-residential areas were noted as such. If the first person the student tried to interview said that he knew nothing about the neighborhood, the student tried someone else.

The information from the interviews was coded by students and plotted on a large base map. A cartographer then drew isolines around the edges of ethnic clusters that appeared on the base map. In some cases it was necessary to make interpolations between points, resulting in boundary areas of questionable reliability.

3. Evaluation of Mapping Procedures.

Limitations of census data was one reason for drawing a map based on a field survey. Among these limitations are the facts that census tract boundaries rarely coincide with the boundaries of ethnic communities; "foreign stock", as used in the census encompasses only immigrants and their children and leaves out of account those who have been in this country for more than two generations; many ethnic groups are not counted in the census.

The 1971 ethnic map spatially defined Detroit's most numerous ethnic groups, and many of its smaller groups as well. The map indicated the locations of Jewish, Southern White and other communities that would not be shown on a map based upon census data.

The 1971 Detroit area map had many limitations. As in any survey, the information gathered in the interviews represented people's perceptions of the ethnic composition of their neighborhoods. The extent to which those perceptions are accurate, in the sense that they would yield the same result as a house-to-house survey, or block-by-block survey, is of course unknown. Some of this possible inaccuracy may be overcome by mapping at the neighborhood scale, using a random sampling method.

The map was limited by technical problems, such as the fact that the scale of the grid was not fine enough to pick up every ethnic group, or to draw

exact boundaries around ethnic communities. There was insufficient manpower to use a finer grid. The quality of the information obtained also depended on how neighborhood residents viewed their neighborhoods, and how well informed they were. Some students had difficulty in finding informants who had the desired information, or who were willing to talk with students, or to discuss ethnicity. Other interviewers found most respondents well informed and cooperative.

Student evaluations of the survey experience varied. One student commented, "I enjoyed doing the interviews". Another student had the impression that:

> Many people seem to be very shy about talking of ethnic groups. When you mention [that this is a] Wayne State University project they listen, but when they hear the word 'ethnic' they suddenly become very busy. Clergy, and people in their late teens and early twenties, seemed to be the best people to talk to.

Since its publication in 1972, the map has been widely used by agencies throughout the metropolitan area. At this time we feel that more detailed mapping of local communities would be useful both for research and teaching purposes.

In addition to the survey questions related to mapping aspects, it would be an easy matter to incorporate questions to serve additional purposes that might relate to:[19]

(a) The history of the neighborhood,

(b) Neighborhood services,

(c) Contacts within the local area,

(d) Qualities of the physical environment,

(e) Quality of housing.

The fourth section of the monograph raises questions related to ethnicity in the Detroit area. Insights regarding these and other questions can be derived from local area surveys.

Suggestions for Ethnic Research Projects in the Detroit Area

1) Descriptive Studies

Little has been done in Detroit to relate race and ethnicity with socio-economic status variables (occupations, income, etc.), or life cycle characteristics (family size and age structure). In other communities in the United States, social area analyses have been conducted using a variety of techniques to identify dimensions that differentiate various subcommunities from one another. One method that has been used for analyzing urban structure is factorial ecology, that is, an examination of the ecological structure of communities using the statistical technique of factor analysis.[20] Comparative studies for a number of North American cities have made it possible to arrive at some tentative generalizations regarding the dimensions that underlie variations in the internal structure of urban areas. The factors or underlying dimensions of spatial variation that usually emerge from these studies are social rank, family life-style, and ethnicity. A number of studies have shown that in the American city socio-economic status varies by sectors, stage in the life cycle of families varies concentrically, and minority groups are spatially clustered or nucleated.

Other studies have focused on the question of residential segregation both as a process through time and as a pattern at a point in time.[21] Tools have been developed to determine which groups are the most segregated, and for what reasons. General spatial patterns, such as clustering, have also been studied. For example, a group could be highly segregated, yet distributed in a number of clusters throughout the urban area rather than concentrated in one section of the city. Differences such as this could have far-reaching implications; for example, the degree of a group's concentration could influence types and numbers of businesses that could develop to serve the community, and the potential for occupational differentiation within the group.[22]

It is essential that we have basic information about the racial and ethnic composition of our urban area both in a static and dynamic sense. Further, we need to correlate this information with other basic data to describe the interrelationships among and between human groups and their socio-economic environments. Once we have done this we can begin moving towards an explanation of why areas differ in the characteristics and behavior of their populations.

2. Some Research Directions

Historically the ethnic communities that formed in urban areas in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth were made up of immigrants having no capital or access to the rewards of an industrializing capitalist society. These urban communities tended to be spatially confined to a few blocks, within which elaborate social networks developed.

But what of today's newly arriving immigrants? Do we have to reconsider what we mean by an ethnic community? For example, there is a Korean Presbyterian community in Detroit -- highly professional, very dispersed throughout the metropolitan area, but with the church as a unifying focus. This too is an ethnic community, no longer geographically confined, but with a close social network made possible by the freeway, automobile, and telephone. What about the Arab community? For many new arrivals the spatially confined area serves the same role that reception areas of the past have served as, for example, an area of South Dearborn which serves as a reception area for recent Arabic speaking immigrants. But, others are moving directly to more outlying suburban areas, joining Arabs who came earlier. In short, we need to examine settlement patterns of newly arriving immigrants, and what role the group, whether it be dispersed or confined, plays for new immigrants. We also need to consider the meaning of ethnicity for second, third, and fourth generation ethnics, whose communities may no longer be geographically confined.

Another aspect of migration to urban centers is what might be termed "the return home syndrome." How many newly arriving immigrants intend to stay in Detroit? How strong are the home contacts? For example, many Appalachian Whites are in effect "commuting migrants", whose ties often are so strong that the family remains in Appalachia while the head of the family earns his income elsewhere. What happens to the returning migrant's status in his home community? What aspects of ethnic community life does he establish in Detroit?

Most central areas of American cities are viewed as undergoing rapid change which marks the dissolution of old ethnic neighborhoods. While, by and large, this may be true, there are still many stable ethnic areas in older sections of cities. In Detroit, for example, many older Polish neighborhoods exhibit aspects of this stability. What makes for the stability of some of these older urban neighborhoods? To what degree is it a result of people's conscious choices? How much depends on the numerical size of the ethnic group relative to other groups, the amount of competition for the housing stock from other groups, and the degree to which an inter-generational sense of ethnicity is maintained? What role do institutions such as churches, schools, businesses, and social clubs play in the maintenance of neighborhood stability? How valid is the idea that sentiment and symbolism can become so attached to land that these considerations override all other factors conducive to neighborhood change?

While it is true that some areas are relatively stable and slow to change, many cities, and Detroit is certainly one of them, have undergone considerable change over the last two decades. Is there any pattern in the sequence of neighborhood change? Limited observations of a Polish neighborhood in Detroit that is undergoing change suggest a sequence similar to that outlined in Figure 2. Some institutions never leave; what are the reasons for this? How

Model of Ethnic Neighborhood Change

GROUP A (most recent arrivals) (Growth)		GROUP B (group preceding Group A) (Decline)	
Process	Stage	Process	Stage
People arrive	Initial entry stage (I)	People leave (who leaves first?)	Early departure stage because of "threat" and socio-economic mobility
Institutions, businesses, etc. follow (which types of businesses come first?)	Growth stage (II)	Some institutions, some businesses, some people, etc. leave. (which leave and which remain?)	Large scale departure stage
Later, other types of businesses enter as the community grows stronger both numerically and economically	Stability and dominance stage (III)	Only residuals remain (what are the residuals? - some businesses -- restaurants, funeral parlors, churches, etc.	Residual element stage (may have residuals in one neighborhood reflecting an area's entire ethnic history)

Fig. 2

important is the amount of capital and social investment in a particular institution? Residual elements usually will remain, and it should be possible to reconstruct the entire ethnic history of any section of the urban area by piecing together scattered elements such as the evidence from church interiors, names on the fronts of buildings, and restaurants that now are city-serving rather than neighborhood-serving.

But what of the people that have left the inner city ethnic enclaves? As the 1971 Detroit area map showed, suburbia is by no means homogenized.[23] How important are ethnic institutions for suburban dwellers raised in central city ethnic neighborhoods? How many of the values that developed in the ethnic neighborhood are carried over into the suburbs? Does the Catholic Church, for example, still play an important role in the lives of people of Polish, Italian and Irish ancestry? Is the extended family network still an important factor in day-to-day living? To what degree to Polish people marry other Poles? Another factor to be considered are the ties that remain with the central city. Certainly many people work there, others have relatives in old ethnic areas, and others still attend church in the neighborhoods in which they were raised. Many new suburbanites are still members of a blue collar, working class, ethnic-oriented culture.[24] This group has legitimate grievances in today's society. Unfortunately many white ethnic institutions are not geared to taking a strong initiative in dealing with social change. What is done both by institutions and individuals to organize white ethnics and speak on behalf of their needs may well be one of the critical issues of the seventies.[25]

One of the reasons for mapping the distribution of Detroit's ethnic groups was to make it possible to determine whether major social service institutions such as hospitals, parks, public transportation lines, as well as major sources of employment were located so as to give each ethnic group equal access to them.[26] With industry rapidly decentralizing and residential segregation of

Blacks a stark reality, a situation is developing whereby suburban industry faces labor shortages and has resorted to busing workers from the inner city. Reverse commuting is very much a part of the journey-to-work pattern here in the Detroit area. Many studies have shown that Blacks have to travel farther to work as well as for medical care, both physician and hospital treatment.

The consequences of public programs that break up ethnic communities need to be evaluated. What are the psychological and social effects of dislocation through urban renewal or expressway construction? How do people adapt to a forced migration? Many examples of this type of renewal can be found in the Detroit area involving, for example, ethnic neighborhoods that were formerly Black, Polish, Arab, Mexican-American, Chinese, Greek or Maltese.

In this section we have outlined some areas of inquiry that we think are important. Partial answers to some of the questions will be forthcoming as more and more data become available. Furthermore, as new ethnic studies programs are introduced into the school systems, teachers might find activities such as the community survey and mapping project a useful teaching and research tool. A detailed mapping of a school district could be an excellent approach for advancing knowledge about the people and institutions that exist in the mosaic of local areas that make up our metropolitan system.

FOOTNOTES

1. The "Introduction", "Rationale", and the sections entitled "Methodological Considerations" and "Suggestions for Ethnic Research Projects in the Detroit Area," were contributed by Bryan Thompson. The section entitled "Theoretical Considerations: Ethnicity, Neighborhood and Community" was contributed by Carol Agocs. Portions of the final two parts of this paper were adapted from Bryan Thompson and Carol Agocs, "Mapping the Distribution of Ethnic Groups in Metropolitan Detroit", (unpublished manuscript) April, 1972.

2. See Judith Herman (ed.), The Schools and Group Identity: Education for a New Pluralism (New York, N. Y.: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, 1974), pp. VII-XI.

3. Barbara C. Aswad, "The Southeast Dearborn Arab Community Struggles for Survival against 'Urban Renewal'," in Arabic Speaking Communities in American Cities, Barbara C. Aswad (ed.), (New York, N. Y.: The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc., 1974), p.62.

4. For an example of a two-category social analysis see Roger Daniels and Harry H. L. Kitano, American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1970.

5. Many social scientists writing in the "melting pot" tradition subscribe to the more sophisticated "triple melting pot" theory, which holds that over the generations, white ethnic groups will merge into one of the three great American religious groupings -- Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Examples include Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor: A Sociologist's Inquiry (Garden City: Anchor, 1963), and Will Herberg, Protestant-Catholic-Jew (New York: Doubleday, 1955).

6. Such works include Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1963); Andrew M. Greeley, Why Can't They Be Like Us?(New York: American Jewish Committee, 1969); and Michael Novak, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics, (New York: Macmillan, 1971).

7. For federal government data-collecting procedures relating to ethnic groups see U. S: Commission on Civil Rights, To Know or Not To Know: Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs, February,1973.

8. Otto Feinstein, "Why Ethnicity", in David W. Hartman (ed.), Immigrants and Migrants: The Detroit Ethnic Experience (Detroit: New University Thought Publishing Co., 1974), p.2.

9. For other definitions in the same vein, see Andrew Greeley, "Ethnicity as an Influence on Behavior", in Otto Feinstein (ed.) Ethnic Groups in the City (Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington, 1971); Leon Singer, "Ethnogenesis and Negro-Americans Today", in Denis Wrong and Harry Gracey (eds.), Readings in Introductory Sociology (New York: Macmillan, 1967); and Fredrik Barth, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969).

10. See for example, George A. Hillery, Jr., "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement", Rural Sociology, 20 (1955), pp. 111-123. Hillery studied 94 definitions of community and found no agreement, beyond the observation that "all of the definitions deal with people". Helpful discussions and compilations of the literature on communities and the community study may be found in Colin Bell and Harold Newby, Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community (New York: Praeger, 1972); Maurice Stein, The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies (New York: Harper and Row, 1960); and Barry Wellman and Marilyn Whitaker, Community-

Network-Communication: An Annotated Bibliography, Monticello, Ill.: Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography No. 282-283, May, 1972.

11. See for example Edward O. Laumann, Bonds of Pluralism: The Form and Substance of Urban Social Networks (N. Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1973).

12. See for example Gerald Suttles, The Social Order of the Slum-Ethnicity and Territoriality in the Inner City (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); and Suttles, The Social Construction of Communities (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972).

13. On ethnic groupings in Southfield, a Detroit suburb, see Mary C. Sengstock, "Southfield--the Ethnic Grosse Pointe", in David W. Hartman (ed.), op.cit., pp. 337-44.

14. See Scott Greer and Ann L. Greer (eds.), Neighborhood and Ghetto: The Local Area in Large-Scale Society (N.Y.: Basic Books, 1974), p.8 and pp. 101-251.

15. John Madge, The Tools of Social Science, Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p.232.

Please refer to "Selected Readings" section for references related to sampling.

16. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Housing: 1970, Block Statistics, Final Report HC (3) -120, Detroit, Mich. Urbanized Area. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1971.

17. Refer to "Selected Readings" section for references related to survey research, questionnaire design, and interviewing.

18. See appendix for a sample of the questionnaire used in the original survey. A similar technique was used in Worcester, Massachusetts. See Harold Creveling, "Mapping Cultural Groups in an American Industrial City," Economic Geography, 31 (1955), 364-371. The technique has been employed recently in Minneapolis. See Richard Wolniewicz, Ethnic Persistence in Northwest Minneapolis: Maps and Commentary, Research Study No. I, Minnesota Project on Ethnic America, Minneapolis, Minn., 1973.

19. Useful references include: A. Charnes, W. W. Cooper, and G. Kosmetsky, "Measuring, Monitoring and Modeling Quality of Life," Management Science, 19, No. 10 (June, 1973), 1172-1188; William Michelson, Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach (Reading, Mass:, Addison-Wesley, 1970).

20. Factor analysis is a method designed to identify "fundamental dimensions of variation lying beneath the many variables characteristically measured for areas". For a discussion of factorial ecology, readers are referred to Economic Geography, 47, No. 2(Supplement), June, 1971. This special issue titled, "Comparative Factorial Ecology" (Brian J. L. Berry, Guest Editor) includes an evaluation of factorial ecology and a number of comparative urban studies. Another helpful discussion is Duncan Timms, The Urban Mosaic: Towards a Theory of Residential Differentiation (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

21. For a discussion of techniques for measuring residential segregation, readers are referred to Karl E. Taeuber and Alma F. Taeuber, Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change (Chicago, Ill.: Aldine, 1965), Appendix A, pp. 195-245.

22. See Martin T. Katzman, "Opportunity, Subculture and the Economic Preference of Urban Ethnic Groups," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 28 (1969), 351-366.

23. For other evidence see Stanley Lieberson, "Suburbs and Ethnic Residential Patterns," American Journal of Sociology, 67 (1962), 673-681.

24. When people move to suburbs, they do not take on a new life style or culture; changes usually occur before the move. Suburbia is not a melting pot, nor is it a "classless society." See Bennett M. Berger, "Suburbia and the American Dream," in Sam Bass Warner (ed.), Planning for a Nation of Cities (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1966).

25. For media comments on grievances of the ethnic working class see Jack Rosenthal, "Anger at Power Structure Voiced at Urban Ethnic Parley," New York Times, June 17, 1970; "A Rising Cry: 'Ethnic Power'," Newsweek, Dec. 21, 1970, 32-36; and Irving M. Levine, "The White Working American," in Catholic Mind, (Jan. 1971), 3-10.

26. A selection of references on the spatial distribution of services in urban areas includes: Richard L. Morrill, Robert J. Earickson, and Philip Rees, "Factors Influencing Distances Travelled to Hospitals," Economic Geography, 46, No.2 (April, 1970), 161-171; Pierre de Vise, Slum Medicine: Chicago Style; How the Material Needs of the City's Negro Poor are Met. Chicago Regional

Hospital Study Working Paper No. 48, Chicago: Hospital Planning Council of Chicago, 1968; Pierre de Vise, Misused and Misplaced Hospitals and Doctors: A Locational Analysis of the Urban Health Care Crisis, Commission on College Geography, Resource Paper No. 22, Washington, D. C.: Association of American Geographers, 1973; Gerald F. Pyle, Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke in Chicago. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago, Department of Geography, 1971 (Research Paper Series No. 134).

SELECTED READINGS

ETHNICITY IN DETROIT

Aberbach, Joel and Walker, Jack, Race in the City: Political Trust and Public Policy in the New Urban System, Little Brown, 1973.

Aswad, Barbara (ed.), Arabic Speaking Communities in American Cities, Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc. and Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc., 1974.

Chaput, Donald, Michigan Indians - A Way of Life Changes, Hillsdale, 1970.

Conant, Robert, American Odyssey, Doubleday, 1974.

Deskins, Donald R., Jr., Residential Mobility of Negroes in Detroit, 1837-1965, Michigan Geographical Publication No. 5, Dept. of Geography, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1972.

Feinstein, Otto (Ed.), Ethnic Groups in the City, Heath Lexington, 1971.

Gordon, Leonard, A City in Racial Crisis, Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971

Hartman, David W. (ed.), Immigrants and Migrants: The Detroit Ethnic Experience, (An Ethnic Studies Reader), Journal of University Studies, vol. 10, Fall, 1974.

Holli, Melvin, Reform in Detroit: Hazen S. Pingree and Urban Politics, Oxford University Press, 1969.

Humphrey, Judy S., Segregation and Integration: A Geography of People in Metropolitan Detroit, (WSU, TTT Project), 1972, Advancement Press.

Katzman, David, Before the Ghetto: Black Detroit in the Nineteenth Century, University of Illinois Press, 1973.

Leggett, John, Class, Race and Labor: Working Class Consciousness in Detroit, Oxford University Press, 1968.

Marger, Martin, The Force of Ethnicity, (WSU Journal of University Studies and Ethnic Bicentennial Monograph Series), 1974.

Mason, Philip, Struggle for Survival: The Story of Michigan's Indians, Detroit Historical Museum, 1968.

Mc Laughlin, Doris, Michigan Labor: A Brief History from 1818 to the Present, Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1970.

Serrin, William, The Company and the Union: The "Civilized Relationship" of the General Motors Corporation and the United Auto Workers, Vintage, 1974.

Sinclair, Robert, The Face of Detroit: A Spatial Synthesis, Department of Geography, Wayne State University, 1970.

Wichorek, Michael and Martha, Ukrainians in Detroit, 1968. (privately published)

Widick, B. J., Detroit: City of Race and Class Violence, Quadrangle, 1973.

SAMPLING REFERENCES

Arkin, Herbert, and Colton, Raymond R., Statistical Methods, 4th ed.; New York, Barnes and Noble, 1956, 113-128.

* Berry, Brian J. L., and Baker, Alan, "Geographic Sampling", in Spatial Analysis: A Reader in Statistical Geography, Brian J. L. Berry and Duane F. Marble (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; Prentice-Hall, 1968, 91-100.

Cochran, William G., Sampling Techniques, New York: John Wiley, 1953.

Cochran, W.G.; Mosteller, F.; and Tukey, J. W., "Principles of Sampling", Journal of the American Statistical Association, 49 (1954), 13-35.

* Deming, William Edwards, Some Theory of Sampling, New York, John Wiley, 1950.

Greig-Smith, P., Quantitative Plant Ecology, New York: Academic Press, 1957, 19-84.

Holmes, John, "Problems in Location Sampling", Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 57 (December, 1967), 757-780.

Kershaw, K. A., Quantitative and Dynamic Ecology, London: Edward Arnold, 1966, 21-38 and 77-95.

Kish, L., Survey Sampling, New York: John Wiley, 1965.

* Moser, C. A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, London: William Heinemann, 1958.

Raj, Deo, Sampling Theory, New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1968.

Rodgers, H.B. Random Sampling Techniques in Social Geography, Geographics Polonica, 18 (1970), 139-156.

Yates, F. Sampling Methods for Censuses and Surveys, London: Charles Griffin, 1960.

Zarkovich, S.S. Sampling Methods and Censuses, Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, 1965.

3. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND INTERVIEWING REFERENCES

* Backstrom, Charles H. and Hursch, Gerald D., Survey Research, Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Clark, Roger N.; Hendee, John C.; Potter, Dale R.;and Sharpe, Katwin M., Questionnaires for Research: An Annotated Bibliography on Design, Construction and Use. USDA Forest Resources Research Paper PNW 140 1972, Portland: Pacific NW Forest and Range Experiment Station, U. S. Department of Agriculture and Forest Service, 1972.

Converse, Jean M. and Schuman, Howard, Conversations at Random: Survey Research As Interviewers See It. New York: John Wiley, 1974.

Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W., Research Methods in Social Relations With Special Reference to Prejudice, Part One: Basic Process. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton and Cook, Stuart,W., Research Methods In Social Relations With Special Reference to Prejudice, Part Two: Selected Techniques. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

Oppenheim, A. N., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, London: Heinemann, 1968.

Shaw, Marvyn E., and Wright, Jack M., Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1967.

* Especially helpful

Sudman, Seymour and Bradburn, Norman M., Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis. Chicago: Aldine, 1974.

4. SELECTED DATA AND AGENCY SOURCES

Data

(a) The U. S. Census and the Detroit Metropolitan Area Data System (DMADS)

DMADS is a computer-based data system that has been compiled from the first and fourth counts of the Census of Population and Census of Housing for 1970. The system can be used to generate statistical data and maps of the seven county Detroit region. Twenty-five hundred variables have been assembled and stored on computer tape. For any one variable, there are 1168 pieces of information corresponding to the frequency with which that variable occurs in each of the region's 1168 census tracts. Further, variables can be manipulated and combined to form new variables. For example, the foreign stock population is generated by combining the foreign born with native of foreign or mixed parentage.

Ethnic data in the census consist of counts of the Black, American Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean, and Spanish origin population, as well as counts of the foreign born and the second generation, or the native population of foreign or mixed parentage. Mother tongue data are also available from the census. In 1970, the respondent, regardless of place of birth, was asked what language other than English was usually spoken in the home when he was a child. Mother tongue data provide a more accurate enumeration of some ethnic populations than counts of foreign stock; in some cases, they provide the only enumeration (e.g. Yiddish).

DMADS can be used to portray the distributional pattern, that is the relative concentration, of each of the 2500 variables throughout the seven county region. Countour-type maps are generated by linear interpolation among the array of 1168 points.

Maps can be drawn at any scale with the maximum map size restricted to a width of 30 inches. Large size maps of small areas such as neighborhoods or communities can also be drawn.

A variety of summary statistics can also be generated, including population totals, location quotients, and percent of variable population in each tract.

For further information about the data system or about obtaining other data, inquiries can be addressed to:

DMADS
Ethnic Studies Division
Center for Urban Studies
Wayne State University
5229 Cass Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(or phone: 313-577-2154)

(b) Agencies in the Detroit Area

Agency	Address	Phone
The International Institute	100 E. Kirby, Detroit 48202	871-8600
Ethnic Studies Division, Center for Urban Studies, Wayne State U.	5229 Cass, Detroit 48202	577-2154
Southeast Michigan Regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Center	71 E. Ferry, Detroit 48202	872-2225
Folklore Archive, Wayne State University	144 Purdy Library	577-4053
Detroit Historical Museum	5401 Woodward, Detroit 48202	833-1805
Burton Historical Collection	Detroit Public Library 5201 Woodward, Detroit 48202	321-1000
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	8th Floor Book Bldg. Detroit 48226	961-4266
Michigan Civil Rights Comm. Research & Planning Division	9th Floor, Cadillac Sq. Bldg. Detroit 48226	256-2622
Detroit Planning Dept. Data Coordination Division (Ms. Patricia Becker)	801 City-County Bldg. Detroit 48226	224-6389

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE 1971 DETROIT AREA ETHNIC MAPPING PROJECT

INTERVIEWER'S NAME_____

CELL NUMBER_____ QUADRANT NUMBER_____

LOCATION (specific cross-streets where interview taken)

_____

1) I'm interested in finding out where different ethnic groups live in the Detroit area. By ethnic, I mean Black, Appalachian white, Polish, German, Jewish, and so on. I'm working on a school project to make a map of ethnic groups in Detroit.

2) Do you know whether most of the people living in this neighborhood - at least half of the residents - are members of one ethnic group?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes, which group?_____

If answer to 2) is No, proceed with question 3:

3) Are there two or three ethnic groups, which when taken together make up at least half of the population of this neighborhood?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes: 2 groups ( ) 3 groups ( )

Which groups?_____, _____, _____.

If answer to 3) is No, then proceed with question 4;

4) Are there more than three ethnic groups represented in this neighborhood?

Yes_____ No_____

If yes: List as many of the ethnic groups represented in the neighborhood as you can_____

_____

5) Do you know precisely where the ethnic group or groups live in this area? Please be as precise as possible.

Group	Cross-streets or landmarks

6) Are most members of this group or groups (over half of them) foreign born, or children of foreign born, or grandchildren of foreign born?

Group	Foreign born	Children of f.b.	Grandchildren of f.b.

7) Other information given by person being interviewed: _____

_____

Thank you very much for your cooperation.